

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
May 3, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Gary Lee, Senior Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:06 PM. Design Review Board members Dennis Cope, Robert Hall, Mery Velastegui and David Wobker were excused.

MEETING CLOSE

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:08 PM. MOTION CARRIED (3-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070026, 166th Avenue Condominiums

Description: 51-unit condo building of 4 floors of residential over 2 parking garage levels.

Location: 8500 166th Avenue NE

Applicant: Redmond Town Center LLC

Prior Review Date(s): 04/19/07

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for the second pre-application review of this project. Staff was interested in hearing the Board's comments regarding the design packet and the issue of the project being short in the open space requirement. Counting the front yard plaza would move them into the 50% range, and they could then purchase in-lieu open space. He questioned if the Board would be comfortable counting the front yard space as part of the open space. Staff also wanted to know whether or not the architectural style is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Brad Butterfield, 21911 76th Avenue W #210, Edmonds, WA 98026, reported that they had addressed the seven points noted by the Board at the first pre-application review. Regarding the open space, there would be a significant amenities room on the fourth floor of the building that would have a bathroom and a full kitchen with a deck on the outside that has a territorial view of the mountains. There would also be a recreational room on the first floor. With the additional amenity space in the front yard, they plan to have a large wood trellis, brick planters, some outdoor seating, and add a double door entrance/exit for further enhancement. On the front elevation, they lowered the cedar corner by two feet and reduced the overhang. They provided a detailed sketch of the overhang, including the aluminum cap and aluminum fascia that they think would work well. Regarding a public space on 166th Avenue NE and although it is quite steeply sloped, they propose to use a retaining wall, a trellis and a bench there. To one Boardmember the kitchen windows on the west elevation seemed small. Because their head heights are 6'10", they did not increase the windows, but they did add an awning to all those windows to allow circulation and to make the windows more fitting with the other windows in the building. Although he was not sure the inside of the building was in the purview of the Board, the long corridor was offset by each condominium unit's door having an alcove so that those doors would not be visible as one is walking down that corridor. To the main entry stair tower, which had an awning they had really liked and a strong cedar fascia with the detail and overhang, they added an aluminum sculptural element. To address the concern

about access to the building by the infirm and disabled, he assured the Board that they do have ADA-compliant access ramps from the sidewalk to the front door.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the building in general. Was excited about seeing this happen because this is a great location for some improvement.
- Thought some of the lack of detailing was because of rendering limitations, such as lintels and sills.
- Wanted to know what kind of brick system. (Mr. Butterfield responded that they are considering a proprietary product that is a brick veneer. To make this affordable, they could not do real brick. He confirmed they could do what would look like a lintel or sill.)
- Confirmed that the applicant planned to do clear cedar with the 20-inch cedar butt jointed and clear caulked. (Mr. Butterfield said he would love to use a Milgard aluminum product rather than white vinyl.)
- Inquired if they had considered a base element made of the same material to appear that it is structural. (The applicant would like for those to be cedar boxes so they would stand out as a strong design element rather than be tight against the sheeting and coming down to the concrete. The shadows from the boxes would be very effective.)
- Confirmed that the applicant would sack the exposed concrete. (The applicant responded that according to the City's Engineering Division, there are a couple of walls that could be colored similar to the parking structure of the building or could be kept natural. Said that he feared that on the building there would be such elegant details and the rock concrete could be a sharp contrast, but if not executed properly would detract from the brick and cedar.
- Confirmed that the applicant would like to use a brick similar to what is shown.
- Said he had no objection to horizontal box metal.
- Found out that the applicant would love to do the fascias and the railing systems in aluminum if affordable so they would work with the windows really well.
- Liked the details on the bracketing for the beams.
- Supported the project.
- Thought the doors to that one open space and the partial enclosure make that area quite a bit more functional.
- Liked the amenity room.
- Wanted to know if there would be concern about light spill or the ability to see light sources from the garage through the louver vents. The applicant responded that there would not.
- Thought there was something lacking on the west elevation. It does not have as much pop and sizzle as the south elevation has. Suggested adding a band, or connector, between the towers on the Hardipanel or the box metal. (Mr. Butterfield explained that they wanted the west elevation to feel like the end of the building and not compete too much with the south elevation or the front of the building. He pointed out that the east elevation and the north elevation work together and are different concepts from the south and the west elevations.)

Mr. Madrid:

- Liked the project. Thought it a very handsome building in a great spot and a great amenity for that area.
- Confirmed that none of the units have Juliet balconies.
- Was interested in the detailing of the railings for the balconies. Requested that they return with those details.
- Confirmed that the fence is on the neighboring property.
- Inquired if the parking screening would be a similar material as the railings on the deck. (The applicant was not sure yet.)
- Was fine with the green space proposal since the applicant is willing to make the upper part an open space. Thought that reasonable.
- Confirmed that the upper units have their own open space separated by walls or planters. Encouraged them to do something nice up there.
- Liked the horizontal element and with a little green up there the top would really pop.

- Liked the idea of the vertical box ribbed siding. If carried out well, would make the building that much better. Would create a nice element and some playfulness to the building as a whole.
- Appreciated the applicant addressing the Board's comments at the first pre-application review.
- Did not have a problem with the west elevation.
- Thought the proposal was certainly on the right track.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thanked the applicant for listening to the Board and pushing the project totally in the right direction.
- Was supportive of the open space as it is open space that might actually be used.
- Questioned how to divide the amenity room's outdoor patio space from its neighbor next door. Thought that might need more separation than the other patios.
- Supported the metal box rib because it is expressive of residential and certainly wears and lasts better than Hardiplank. Thought that if they picked the right box rib it might give the right residential expression.

Mr. Lee commented that staff is leery about box ribbed metal siding.

There was agreement that the project was ready for approval.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE-060075, Center Pointe

Description: Two new structures including a two-story office building replicating the original Redmond Train Depot and a six-story mixed use building

Location: Gilman, Leary and 164th Avenue NE

Applicant: Redmond Gateway LLC

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee presented the staff report for this first pre-application review for the former site of T & D Feed. He reported that staff is excited about this proposal. The applicant is proposing a rhythmic projection of balconies over the sidewalk. There are also bay window popouts. He passed out photographs of other projects in the downtown. On the pictures of the Urbane project, he pointed out that there is a rhythmic projection of the bay windows and the places where the balconies will be. At the bottom of the balcony line, there was a continuous line. The line of overhang over the sidewalk is an almost straight line. The code says that projections are allowed to break up or benefit the architecture. He wanted to know if the proposed has too much overhang. The City's historic expert, Dianna Broadie, had brought up the comment that generally the design meets the Old Town criteria, but she would suggest strengthening the banding between the third and fourth, fifth and sixth floors. She thought there needed to be more detail on the garage doors. There is an arched element that appears to be floating, so there could be pilasters or pillars to hold that up. Pre-finished metal siding and Hardipanel are not materials that are compatible with the 1800s and 1900s. There is a thin separation between the windows, but there should be broader mullions which would be more characteristic with wood windows—basically not using such a modern frame.

Mike Millett, 1218 3rd Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101, head designer of the project, went over the boards showing the setting of the project. They are proposing a small office building that is a replica of the original train depot. The main building would be significantly larger, four stories over a retail level at the street. There would be two parking levels below grade. The car access for retail would be off 164th Avenue NE, while the car access for the residential would be off Gilman, with no car access off Cleveland. There would be a large plaza above the parking for the residents to look down upon. The base of the building is pretty consistently brick. The overhang is two stories up. This is a brick structure up to that point. The windows in the retail are broken up in the upper portion with small panes and larger panes in the lower portion. There is a canopy at the central entry made of galvanized steel structure. There are also canopies at the corner to emphasize the entries into the retail areas. There are balconies between the protruding bays. The windows on the retail have transom units and small lights. On the south façade, the building steps back at the residential level from the parking and retail. He showed proposed colors. The brick color is a brown/black tumbled brick that is rough, looks old, has a lot of texture, and variation with some whiteness from the tumbling. The Hardipanel would be lap board (horizontal) or board and batten (vertical). The

other issue is the corner element on Cleveland and Gilman. This would be an octagonal element reminiscent of the grain and wheat silos that were on the site at one time. They propose a pre-finished metal siding. There is articulation at the top of the wall where the base sticks out to form an overhang.

The landscape architect explained that they wanted to have fun with the landscape and use some ribbing or color for the sidewalk paving. He showed the existing and new trees. They want to develop a screening and architectural statement with the landscape. There are walkways connecting the doors. They will use columnar trees not to overpower the spaces. On the podium level, they will use rainwater to activate the downspouts down into the four cisterns in the plaza. There would be an activity space with benches and a barbeque near the exercise room that they would like to expand out four to five feet.

The applicant, in thinking of the future of the Burlington-Northern right-of-way, plans for a strong pedestrian connector in time, so they have increased the height of the interior garage space along the right-of-way to 16-17 feet, enough to allow for future expansion as retail space. In terms of the landscaping treatment on the portion against the right-of-way, they are going to think of that in the long term to be able to bring people into those retail spaces.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Meade:

- Did not know what to say about the depot building because he had not seen images of the one they are trying to copy. (Mr. Lee stressed the importance that the proposal is something that looks like that era, but there is no requirement to do so. He commented that the proposed design does not look much like the original building. The proposal is a much nicer building than the original.)
- Agreed with staff's concern about the modulation because it seems massive and overwhelming now. Was trying to break it down into pieces to understand. Thought the addition of columns was helpful. The base being 17 feet high might help with the modulation. Would like to see a larger band than 2 feet at the head of the brick, a deeper section to better indicate support the upper portion. The two feet would be better being 3, 3.5 or 4 feet to be more in keeping with the historic district concept.
- Commented that the Board is seeing lots of Hardipanel in all of its iterations—even some new ones. Wondered about the tripartite organization of this building. The recesses on a couple of bays are not enough. He would like to see more tipping of the hat toward the historic organization of the building from a siding and color standpoint with the base, shaft and capital strongly represented around the entire structure. Thought staff should share some nearby projects that are successful in that respect.
- Said he wanted to be able to look at this and say this is a modern, stylized version of a historic building.
- Saw some tower elements that were very thin on the south elevation. (The applicant explained that they have not been wrapped back far enough in the drawings, but that will be done.)
- Liked the landscape plan for the open space.
- Agreed with staff on the glazing comment on the windows. There is a certain set of standards for this neighborhood with regard to window organization and style. Suggested that the applicant look at that to see what can be incorporated in response to that, specifically the asymmetrical windows where there is an operable piece on one side and a fixed section on the other side.)
- Would delete the panel siding in lieu of one of the other two and figure out a way to break it up with either another reveal size on the horizontal or color. The panel is not working for the project.
- Thought the trellises over the decks were really confining and strained, and should come out further.
- Thought they could do something with the roof that might be more functional and more maintainable over time.
- Did not think the grain elevators were round, but rectilinear. He suggested contacting the Historical Society to find out the original shape.
- Commented that he did not see Redmond in this space. Appreciated that they are thinking about the corner element as being some notion of what was there before, but currently the building could be anywhere. There is the opportunity to do something more grounded in Cleveland Street, Redmond, USA.
- Suggested pushing the center unit in further on the Cleveland side.

- Pointed out that none of the old depots were built in brick. He did not think brick would be appropriate here. These are simple, humble buildings made of wood. He encouraged them to look at the pallet and size of the lap, maybe 2x6-inch tongue-and-groove. These buildings are often dark blue or dark red, a striking color—sometimes white—with a different color trim.
- Had no dramatic reactions to the color pallet. How the color works with the form is going to be important. He suggested they look at the neighboring buildings and be less like the CMU building across Cleveland.

Mr. Madrid:

- Thought the Hardipanel is a concern. Hardipanel can be difficult. Suggested taking a look at a different material. There can be too much Hardipanel. In general, Hardipanel is fine but has to be done the right way.
- Suggested that a picture or a sketch of the original depot would be helpful. If not a replication, need to know the theory. The materials would be critical because this must look like a historical building.
- Considered the landscaping for the plaza very attractive and well thought out. Would like to see more detail on the commons space—maybe some outdoor seating. Otherwise, landscaping is going in the right direction.
- Liked the idea about taking off the architecture on the sidewalk. That would be interesting.
- Wanted to know more about the octagonal corner. Suggested that they bring more details for the next review. The mass of the building is there. The corners would really stand out. If this is to be the centerpiece corner, then he wanted to see how it would work. Should be a nice solid base for the rest of the building to surround.
- Had a concern about the roll-up garage doors—not a fan of them. Understands they are for functional purposes and that Ms. Broadie also had a concern about them from a historic standpoint. Suggested that the applicant look at this and bring back a few options.
- Wondered if the windows need more work. Want them to be uniformly interesting from a creative and historic standpoint. Encouraged the applicant to look at them more closely.
- Thought landscape could be interesting going up the screens and trellises going up the solid wall of the parking areas.
- Wanted to know if the stairs were necessary for code. (The applicant said the stairs were not a code requirement, but would provide a good way for the residents to get down that podium.)
- Commented that he did not like the gate look next to the stairs.
- Thought that in general the project was starting in a good spot, but needed to evolve.
- Was struggling with the mass of the building.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Commented that this is a huge project and she wondered if there was an opportunity to break the building down at least visually to make it feel like two or three projects instead of one big mass.
- Thought they should explore doing the grain elevator metal siding somewhere because there is some nostalgia associated with that area.
- Noted that this would be a building seen from all four sides.
- Appreciated that they planned eventually to bring the retail around to the railroad side. Liked the gesture of the promenade off the upper open space. The more they could do to make that railroad right-of-side less of a back door, the better. Suggested that they think of the railroad right-of-way as a street.
- Liked the brick.
- Suggested dividing the upper level of windows. All of the buildings in the historic section need to be tied together.
- Thought conceptually they were going in the right direction.
- Thought the landscape was going in the right direction. Thought there was more that could be done to have fun with it.
- Did not think the building was exciting.
- Thought it might be premature to talk about color.
- Appreciated the applicant coming in at this point.

ADJOURNMENT

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
AT 8:50 PM. MOTION CARRIED (3-0).**

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY